



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 21, 2004

Ms. Ruth H. Soucy  
Manager and Legal Counsel  
Open Records Division  
Comptroller of Public Accounts  
P.O. Box 13528  
Austin, Texas 78711-3528

OR2004-3230

Dear Ms. Soucy:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 199092.

The Comptroller of Public Accounts (the "comptroller") received a request for "several categories of information relating to franchise tax." You state that you will make some of the requested information available to the requestor. You also state that you are relying on Open Records Letter No. 98-2388 (1998) to withhold some of the requested information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001) (listing criteria for second type of previous determination under Gov't Code § 552.301). You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

You assert that some of the submitted documents are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming

---

<sup>1</sup> We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body.<sup>2</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives.<sup>3</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body seeking to establish that a communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege must inform this office of the identity and capacity of each individual involved in the communication. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a communication that is confidential. *Id.* 503(b)(1). A confidential communication is a communication that was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

---

<sup>2</sup> The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is acting in a capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element.

<sup>3</sup> Specifically, the privilege applies only to confidential communications between the client or a representative of the client and the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer; between the lawyer and the lawyer’s representative; by the client or a representative of the client, or the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein; between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E); *see also id.* 503(a)(2), (a)(4) (defining “representative of the client,” “representative of the lawyer.”)

You state that the indicated information reflects communications between agency decision-makers and agency attorneys. You explain that the agency attorneys were acting as legal counsel for the agency in these communications by offering legal opinions in response to requests for legal guidance by agency decision-makers. You also state that information has not been disclosed outside of the attorney-client privilege, and that this privilege has not been waived by the agency or the agency attorneys. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the indicated information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1).

You also assert that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). The comptroller is a law enforcement agency for purposes of administering the Tax Code. *A & T Consultants, Inc. v. Sharp*, 904 S.W.2d 668, 679 (Tex. 1995). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in [a law enforcement agency], avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine [law enforcement] efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has stated that under the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b), a governmental body may withhold information that would reveal law enforcement techniques or procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 341 (1982) (release of certain information from Department of Public Safety would unduly interfere with law enforcement because release would hamper departmental efforts to detect forgeries of drivers' licenses), 252 (1980) (predecessor to section 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement).

To claim this exception, a governmental body must explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301; Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under predecessor to section 552.108), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state that some of the submitted information “shows how to access and use the agency’s internal and confidential tax systems, how to process for penalty, interest, and referral to the Attorney General for collection procedures.” Additionally, you state that this information “contains sample records from internal computer systems to illustrate the information being discussed.” Furthermore, you argue that release of this information “would interfere with the investigation, detection, and prosecution of tax collection and enforcement.” Based on your arguments and our careful review of the indicated information, we do not agree that the release of the indicated information would interfere with tax collection and enforcement. Accordingly, we conclude that the comptroller must release the indicated information to the requestor.

Finally, the comptroller contends that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Tex. Dep’t of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ) and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, or opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993); see also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; Open Records Decision No. 615 at 4-5.

You state that the indicated information consists of e-mails in which agency personnel make recommendations and offer their opinions primarily regarding the Investment Tax Credit. You explain that the employees participating in the discussions are specialists in the area of franchise tax and are members of the agency’s Tax Policy Division, Revenue Estimating Division, and Account Maintenance Division. After reviewing your arguments and the information at issue, we agree that you may withhold the indicated information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, we find that the comptroller may withhold the indicated information pursuant to sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lauren E. Kleine". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Lauren E. Kleine  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEK/seg

Ref: ID# 199092

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sarah A. Stroud  
Ryan & Company  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1900  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)